

**Functional Series 400 – Personnel
ADS 462 – Employee Evaluation Program**

***This chapter has been revised in its entirety.**

Table of Contents

<u>462.1</u>	<u>OVERVIEW</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>462.2</u>	<u>PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>462.3</u>	<u>POLICY AND PROCEDURES</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>462.3.1</u>	<u>Employee Evaluation Program Basics.....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>462.3.1.1</u>	<u>Appraisal Periods.....</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>462.3.1.2</u>	<u>Rating Officials.....</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>462.3.1.3</u>	<u>Appraisal Committees.....</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>462.3.1.4</u>	<u>Annual Evaluation Form (USAID 400-1)</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>462.3.2</u>	<u>Performance Plans</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>462.3.2.1</u>	<u>Work Objectives.....</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>462.3.2.2</u>	<u>Performance Measures.....</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>462.3.2.3</u>	<u>Review and Approval of Performance Plans.....</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>462.3.3</u>	<u>Unacceptable Performance.....</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>462.3.3.1</u>	<u>Unacceptable Performance by Civil Service Employees</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>462.3.3.2</u>	<u>Unacceptable Performance by Foreign Service Employees.....</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>462.3.4</u>	<u>Progress Reviews.....</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>462.3.5</u>	<u>Gathering Appraisal Information.....</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>462.3.5.1</u>	<u>Employee Self Assessments</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>462.3.5.2</u>	<u>360 Degree Input Sources</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>462.3.5.3</u>	<u>Mission Controllers, Contracting Officers, and Regional Legal Advisors .</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>462.3.6</u>	<u>Evaluations.....</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>462.3.6.1</u>	<u>Interim Evaluations</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>462.3.6.2</u>	<u>Multiple Interim Evaluations</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>462.3.7</u>	<u>Civil Service Rating of Record.....</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>462.3.7.1</u>	<u>Adjectival Ratings for Work Objectives</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>462.3.7.2</u>	<u>Summary Ratings</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>462.3.8</u>	<u>Appraisal Committee Review and Approval of the Evaluation</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>462.3.8.1</u>	<u>Appraisal Committee FS Promotion Recommendations</u>	<u>18</u>

<u>462.3.9</u>	<u>Employee Feedback Sessions</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>462.3.10</u>	<u>Reconsideration of AEFs</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>462.3.11</u>	<u>Submission of Annual Evaluation Forms</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>462.3.12</u>	<u>Training</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>462.4</u>	<u>MANDATORY REFERENCES</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>462.4.1</u>	<u>External Mandatory References</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>462.4.2</u>	<u>Internal Mandatory References</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>462.5</u>	<u>ADDITIONAL HELP</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>462.6</u>	<u>DEFINITIONS</u>	<u>21</u>

ADS 462 - Employee Evaluation Program

462.1 OVERVIEW

The Employee Evaluation Program is intended to provide a systematic process by which the Agency involves its employees in improving organizational effectiveness in the accomplishment of Agency mission and goals by

- Establishing clear linkages between the Agency's goals, operating unit strategic objectives, and employees' work;
- Improving communications about organizational objectives and individual career goals;
- Developing the capacity to perform;
- Providing [feedback](#) to employees to motivate them to work more effectively, improve their skills, and prepare themselves for increased responsibilities;
- Providing a basis for cash awards, bonuses, and pay adjustments based on performance and other non-monetary awards for performance; and
- Providing performance evaluation documentation to Foreign Service Performance Boards so that they may make decisions concerning promotion, retention, awards, career extension, denial of step increases, and separation.

This chapter applies to all

- Civil Service (CS) (including Schedule C employees and employees whose appointments are administratively determined) under the authority of 5 U.S.C. 43 and 5 CFR 430, Performance Management, Subpart B, Performance Appraisal for General Schedule, Prevailing Rate and Certain Other Employees.
- Foreign Service (FS) and Senior Foreign Service (SFS) under the authority of Sections 601-605 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as amended.

This chapter does not apply to Presidential Appointees, Senior Executive Service (SES) employees, and Experts and Consultants.

462.2 PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES

a. The [Principal Officer](#) of an Operating Unit is responsible for managing his or her Operating Unit's performance evaluation program. This includes communicating objectives, goals, policies, procedures, and deadlines; ensuring compliance with the program; designating employees to play particular roles in the program; and keeping M/HR abreast of important information concerning the Employee Evaluation Program.

- b. Employees are responsible for participating in their own evaluation from beginning to end. This includes helping to develop their performance plans, working toward those goals, evaluating themselves, and participating orally and in writing in review and feedback sessions.
- c. Each Rating Official is responsible for working closely with individual employees throughout the review cycle to create performance plans, evaluating performance, providing feedback, and revising plans as appropriate. These actions culminate with the Rating Official's responsibility to provide a complete Annual Evaluation Form for the Appraisal Committee and the Bureau for Management, Office of Human Resources (M/HR).
- d. Each Appraisal Committee is responsible for reviewing and discussing AEFs and Skills Feedback Worksheets (SFWs) with Rating Officials, providing input to the evaluation, and formally approving the AEF. Throughout the evaluation process, the Appraisal Committee and individual members of the Committee must ensure that Rating Officials comply with the policies and procedures in this chapter. The Appraisal Committee provides assistance to and helps to resolve conflicts for the Rating Officials and employees. Additionally, the Appraisal Committee recommends FS and SFS employees for promotion.
- e. Foreign Service Performance Boards are responsible for reviewing and ranking the members of a Foreign Service salary class based on relative performance and making recommendations for promotions, retention, awards, career extension, denial of step increases, and separation.
- f. The Bureau for Management's Office of Human Resources (M/HR) is responsible for this program's formulation, monitoring, revision, and training. Additionally, as appropriate, M/HR is responsible for action against those who fail to comply with this program.

462.3 POLICY AND PROCEDURES

The following are the official Agency policies and procedures on the Employee Evaluation Program.

462.3.1 Employee Evaluation Program Basics

The Employee Evaluation Program begins with the Principal Officer of each Operating Unit. The Principal Officer

- Establishes overall operating unit strategic objectives and communicates to employees the relationship between Agency goals and the operating unit's strategic objectives;

- Communicates information on the evaluation process to all employees in the unit, including establishing and publicizing internal deadlines and procedures for completing each phase of the process;
- Ensures the operating unit's adherence to Agency policies, procedures and schedules governing the Employee Evaluation Program; and
- Notifies M/HR of action that should be taken against employees who have failed to adhere to the policies, procedures, and schedules of the Employee Evaluation Program;

In turn, M/HR initiates appropriate action against Agency management officials and employees who fail to comply with the policies, procedures, and schedules of the Employee Evaluation Program. M/HR also formulates employee evaluation policies, procedures, and guidelines after monitoring the operation and evaluating implementation of the Employee Evaluation Program, and the related pay and awards systems affected by this program.

To understand the policies and procedures for each part of the evaluation cycle, you must first familiarize yourself with four important aspects of the Employee Evaluation Program: appraisal periods, Rating Officials, Appraisal Committees, and the Annual Evaluation Form (AEF).

462.3.1.1 Appraisal Periods

USAID has established separate appraisal periods for Civil Service and Foreign Service employees. The length of the appraisal period is one year.

- For the Civil Service, the appraisal period runs from January 1 through December 31.
- For the Foreign Service, the appraisal period is from April 1 through March 31.

Written performance appraisals are to be completed whenever a Rating Official or employee is reassigned to another position. The written performance appraisals are to be completed before the Rating Official or employee's departure. A written performance appraisal must be prepared by a Rating Official on an Annual Evaluation Form (AEF) whenever an employee has served in a position for 120 days or more.

a. No written performance appraisal (fewer than 120 days)

Employees are to be given 120 days in which to perform against a performance plan before a Rating Official can appraise performance. No written performance appraisal is required if an employee has not been in a position for 120 days or more. However, the Rating Official may be asked to provide performance feedback to the Rating Official who is preparing the written performance appraisal for the rating cycle. A Civil Service employee who did not work under a performance plan for 120 days during the rating cycle will have the rating cycle extended past December 31.

b. Interim Evaluations (120 to 184 days)

Interim evaluations cover an appraisal period between 120 and 184 days. Rating Officials must complete an Annual Evaluation Form (AEF) on an employee if the employee has been assigned to a position for 120 days but fewer than 185 days. Rating Officials who prepare the final, full AEF are to consider interim AEFs as performance feedback.

c. Full Evaluations (185 days or more)

Full evaluations cover an appraisal period of 185 days or more. Rating Officials must complete all sections of the AEF and complete the Skills Feedback Worksheet.

If an employee is on temporary duty (TDY) at another duty station for 45 days or more, an appropriate official at the TDY duty station will prepare for the employee's Rating Official a written narrative on the performance of the employee.
--

(See 462.3.6 for specific evaluation requirements.)

462.3.1.2 Rating Officials

A Rating Official is an employee's supervisor as designated by the Principal Officer of the Operating Unit. Rating Officials play an essential role in the Employee Evaluation Program since they

- Develop work objectives and performance measures for each rated employee;
- Observe, evaluate performance, and provide ongoing feedback to each employee;
- Conduct a mid-cycle review with each employee;

- Review an employee's self-assessment and work products, gather additional performance information from relevant sources (360 degree input), draft the Annual Evaluation Form (AEF) (USAID 400-1) and Skills Feedback Worksheet (SFW) (USAID 400-3) and discuss both with the Appraisal Committee;
- Revise the draft AEF as directed by an Appraisal Committee; and
- Discuss the approved Appraisal Committee approved AEF and SFW with each rated employee.

462.3.1.3 Appraisal Committees

Appraisal Committees provide an organizational perspective of an employee's performance. The committees also ensure that all AEFs are equitable and objective. An appraisal committee or [appraisal committee representative](#) is involved with almost every aspect of the Employee Evaluation Program.

a. Appraisal Committee Functions

- Review and approve work objectives and performance measures for all operating unit employees.
- Certify that mid-cycle reviews have been conducted for all unit employees.
- Assist Rating Officials with employee performance problems, including resolving conflicts between Rating Officials and employees.
- Review and discuss Annual Evaluation Forms (AEFs) and Skills Feedback Worksheets (SFWs) with Rating Officials, providing input to the evaluation, and formally approving the AEF. This review includes ensuring that 360 degree input was obtained and used appropriately by all Rating Officials; ensuring that employee self-assessments were reviewed and considered by Rating Officials and ensuring evaluations are properly prepared and are equitable and objective.
- Recommending FS and SFS employees for promotion;

b. Who is on the Appraisal Committee?

Appraisal Committees must include at least three members, not including Rating Officials. Rating Officials who are members of an Appraisal Committee must recuse themselves as members and may not participate in Appraisal Committee deliberations when the Appraisal Committee reviews the AEFs they prepared as Rating Officials.

At least one member of the Appraisal Committee other than the Rating Official must be familiar with the work of the rated employee whose performance the Appraisal Committee will review. Large operating units must establish more than one Appraisal Committee to effectively review all employees.

The Principal Officer for each operating unit shall establish an Appraisal Committee. The Officer must appoint only U.S. Direct Hire employees to Appraisal Committees. Probationary CS and Career Candidate FS employees are not eligible to serve on Appraisal Committees. The Principal Officer may appoint supervisors, managers, or other individuals who have knowledge of the work of the operating unit. The Principal Officer may establish team-based Appraisal Committees.

The Bureaus will convene special Appraisal Committees in USAID/Washington (USAID/W) to review all AEFs prepared by Ambassadors on Mission Directors.

462.3.1.4 Annual Evaluation Form (USAID 400-1)

The Annual Evaluation Form (AEF) (USAID 400-1) is used to evaluate the performance of all U.S. Direct Hire employees other than Foreign Service Nationals, Senior Executive Service employees, and Presidential Appointees. Completed AEFs are not official records of performance until approved by the appropriate Appraisal Committee. Draft AEFs must not be discussed or shared with employees.

All AEFs shall be prepared by the Rating Official and approved by the unit Appraisal Committee, except for the Mission Director AEFs. The Ambassador will prepare these AEFs, and the appropriate Assistant Administrator (AA) will prepare an additional page to attach to the AEF. USAID/W Appraisal Committees will decide whether to recommend a Mission Director for promotion.

When completing the form, do not exceed the space allowed. You must complete the forms in 10 point "Universal" font only or 10 or 12 pitch type if completed on a typewriter.

The AEF consists of five sections.

a. Section 1 – Administrative Details

Rating Officials shall complete this section throughout the rating cycle.

b. Section 2 – Role in the Organization

Rating Officials are to describe the employee's role in the organization in terms of number of employees supervised, the size of the unit, and its relation to the Agency and/or Strategic goals.

- c. Section 3 – Work Objectives and Performance Measures**
- Rating Officials in consultation with employees establish work objectives and performance measures, which describe the expectations of the employee for the year. The Appraisal Committee Representative must review and approve work objectives before they are considered official. The employee's signature in Section 1 indicates that the employee was given a copy of the document and that it was discussed with the employee.
 - Rating Officials of CS employees are to indicate whether the work objective is critical or non-critical.
 - For Civil Service employees, at the end of the rating cycle, rating officials are to assign an adjectival rating for each work objective and performance measure, i.e., Exceptional, Excellent, Effective, Needs Improvement, or Unacceptable. Based on the adjectival ratings of work objectives, the Rating Official shall include a [Summary rating](#) on page 1 of the AEF.
- d. Section 4 – Assessment of Work Objectives and Performance Measures**
- Rating Officials are to prepare a written assessment of an employee's accomplishments.
 - For FS employees, Rating Officials are to state categorically whether the employee met, exceeded, or did not meet all work objectives.
- e. Section 5 – Assessment of Skills and Potential**
- Rating Officials are to assess an employee's demonstration of skills.
 - For FS employees, Rating Officials are to state categorically whether the employee met, exceeded, or did not meet the skill standards for his or her class. Rating Officials are also to discuss the FS employee's potential.

462.3.2 Performance Plans

Performance plans are documents prepared by a Rating Official in consultation with an employee that contain statements of performance expectations and results to be achieved. The plan informs the employee of the standards by which his or her performance will be judged. Performance plans consist of work objectives and performance measures.

Performance Plans are approved by the Appraisal Committee Representative and given to employees within 45 days after the beginning of

- The [annual rating cycle](#), or
- An employee's assignment to a new position; [or temporary duty assignments or details expected to last longer than 120 days].

462.3.2.1 Work Objectives

Employees and their Rating Officials are to collaborate in the development of work objectives. Work objectives developed must be within the employee's control to accomplish. Performance Plans must have no less than two work objectives.

- For FS employees, work objectives must be commensurate with the employee's personal grade, not his or her position's grade.
- For CS employees, work objectives must be commensurate with an employee's official position. For CS employees, Rating Officials are to designate which work objectives are critical and non-critical.

462.3.2.2 Performance Measures

Employees and their Rating Officials must define at least one performance measure for each work objective. Performance measures establish the qualitative or quantitative standards expected from the employee.

For CS employees, performance measures must be written at the Effective level.

462.3.2.3 Review and Approval of Performance Plans

An Appraisal Committee Representative shall be assigned to each operating unit to serve as a liaison between employees, Rating Officials, and the Appraisal Committee. The Appraisal Committee Representative will

- a. Review, provide input, and approve performance plans for all employees in the operating unit.
- b. Review and approve any substantive revision of work objectives and/or performance measures during the rating period.

An employee's performance plan becomes effective when approved by the employee's Appraisal Committee Representative.

462.3.3 Unacceptable Performance

If an employee is not performing satisfactorily against established work objectives and performance measures and/or is displaying deficiencies in specific skill areas, the Rating Official must provide early and constructive feedback outlining the measures the employee must take to improve.

462.3.3.1 Unacceptable Performance by Civil Service Employees

When a Civil Service employee's performance fails to meet established performance measures at an acceptable level in one or more [critical elements](#), the employee must be notified in writing. The notice must advise the employee

- That his/her performance is unacceptable;
- Which critical element(s) and performance measure(s) are being performed unacceptably;
- What is needed to perform at a level above the Unacceptable rating level (a written performance measure for the Needs Improvement level);
- Any assistance that will be provided;
- Of the reasonable period to demonstrate acceptable performance; and
- That failure to perform at an acceptable performance level may result in removal, reduction in grade, withholding of a [within grade increase](#), or reassignment depending upon the performance factors.

If the employee demonstrates acceptable performance during the [opportunity period](#), the notice of [unacceptable performance](#) will be retained by the Rating Official for one year from the date the opportunity period became effective. Acceptable performance means performance that meets an employee's performance measure(s) at the Needs Improvement level in the work objective at issue.

462.3.3.2 Unacceptable Performance by Foreign Service Employees

A Foreign Service employee shall be notified in writing if the employee's performance is unacceptable in one or more work objectives or performance shows deficiencies in one or more specific skill areas. Unacceptable performance means that the employee is failing to meet the established work objectives and performance measures and/or is displaying skill deficiencies that must be improved. The Rating Official must provide the employee with examples of unacceptable performance and must provide close supervision.

The Rating Official must give this written notice to the employee when it becomes clear to him or her that work objectives and performance measures will not be met or when specific skills are significantly deficient. Usually, this notice will be given to the employee by mid-cycle. The Rating Official must give the notice to the employee after mid-cycle only when he or she is not able to determine by mid-cycle whether the employee will meet the established work objectives and performance measures.

Further, the Rating Official shall inform the Appraisal Committee of this action.

462.3.4 Progress Reviews

Rating Officials must conduct at least one [progress review](#) with each employee, normally at mid-cycle, during an appraisal period and are encouraged to provide progress reviews to employees on a continuous basis throughout the rating cycle

For the mid-cycle progress review, employees should provide their Rating Officials with the names of customers, peers, subordinates (if any), and any other person with whom they may have worked during the rating cycle who can provide their Rating Officials with information about their performance.

During progress reviews, Rating Officials and employees are to discuss the employee's progress toward achieving work objectives. If an employee's progress toward achieving work objectives is unacceptable, the Rating Official must notify the employee in writing about his or her unacceptable performance and give the employee an opportunity to improve.

Rating Officials must document on the AEF any revisions, additions, or deletions of work objectives and performance measures.

The Rating Official, employee, and Appraisal Committee Representative must sign the AEF, indicating that a mid-cycle progress review took place and that any revisions were approved by the Appraisal Committee.

462.3.5 Gathering Appraisal Information

Rating Officials must base employee performance appraisals on multiple sources of information including the following:

- a. Direct observation of performance and the evaluation of representative work products;
- b. The employee's self-assessment of performance;
- c. Information solicited from individuals who can provide informed views of the employee's performance during the rating cycle (360 degree input sources).

- d. The review and input of the members of the unit's Appraisal Committee.

462.3.5.1 Employee Self Assessments

At the end of an appraisal period, employees should provide Rating Officials with a written assessment of their performance during the appraisal period. Employees should note on the self-assessments whether they received interim evaluations and which office or post prepared them. Copies of interim evaluations are to be attached to the employee's self-assessment.

462.3.5.2 360 Degree Input Sources

a. Employee Submission of Names

At the end of the appraisal period, employees should also provide the Rating Official with the names of customers, peers, subordinates (if any), and any other person with whom they may have worked during the appraisal period who can provide the Rating Official with information about their performance. Rating Officials will contact at least three of these sources for performance information.

b. Agreeing Upon 360 Degree Input Sources

Rating Officials and employees are required to agree on at least three individuals whom the Rating Official will contact to gather performance information. Rating Officials are free to contact more than three individuals on the employee's list or other sources deemed appropriate. If the Rating Official and employee cannot agree on at least three individuals, the Appraisal Committee Representative will decide the matter.

Rating Officials of supervisors are required to contact no fewer than two subordinates for information about the supervisor's human resource management skills.

c. Soliciting Input from 360 Degree Input Sources

When questioning 360 degree input sources, Rating Officials should focus their questions on job-relevant discussions of work objectives and performance measures. It is the Rating Official's responsibility to reconcile the differences of opinion and determine which viewpoint is most accurate. It is not appropriate for the Rating Official to convene a meeting of 360-degree input sources to discuss an employee in order to resolve conflicting input.

For FS and SFS employees, Rating Officials should solicit information about their demonstration of skills and abilities relevant to the standards of their class.

Rating Officials' notes on feedback from 360 degree input sources are personal working notes. There is no requirement to maintain these notes or provide them to the employee. However, if significant performance problems are identified during the process that will result in one of the following then, supporting documentation obtained from all sources must be maintained and shared with the Appraisal Committee if so requested.

- An evaluation of less than Effective for CS employees, or
- An FS employee failing to meet the employee's work objectives or is deficient in one or more specific skill areas.

Rating Officials should be prepared to discuss 360 degree performance information with the Appraisal Committee if requested and to provide names of such contacts should the Appraisal Committee choose to consult these individuals independently.

462.3.5.3 Mission Controllers, Contracting Officers, and Regional Legal Advisors

At their election, the Offices of Financial Management, Procurement, and the General Counsel may prepare brief statements for Rating Officials regarding the performance of Mission Controllers, Contracting Officers, and Regional Legal Advisors. These statements must not contain recommendations or references to suitability for promotion.

Rating Officials who receive such brief statements are required to consider them when preparing final, full AEFs.

The statements are to be attached to the AEF and submitted to the Appraisal Committee for its consideration in evaluating the employee. The statement shall be attached to the final AEF submitted to M/HR.

Rating Officials and the Appraisal Committee must not make negative inferences if an Office does not submit a statement.

462.3.6 Evaluations

Using the multiple sources of information described in 462.3.5, Rating Officials must prepare AEFs. Rating Officials must determine as a factual matter, whether the employee met, did not meet, or exceeded the performance measure of each work objective.

As explained in 462.3.1.1, there are two types of evaluations: interim and full.

462.3.6.1 Interim Evaluations

Interim evaluations cover an appraisal period between 120 and 184 days. For interim evaluations, Rating Officials are to complete sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the AEF. For CS employees, interim AEFs must include a summary rating.

- Interim AEFs are reviewed and approved by Appraisal Committees.
- Employees shall receive copies of interim AEFs.
- Rating Officials who prepare interim AEFs are to forward those AEFs to the Rating Officials who are preparing the full evaluation for the rating cycle.

Normally, interim evaluations are retained in the operating unit and not submitted to the Office of Human Resources for filing in an employee's Official Evaluation File.

However, under certain circumstances as follows, interim evaluations can be filed in an employee's Official Evaluation File:

- a. FS employees: An interim AEF will be submitted by the operating unit to the Office of Human Resources when the employee received a full AEF from a prior operating unit and the employee has worked in his or her current operating unit no less than 120 days prior to the end of the rating cycle.
- b. CS employees: At the option of the CS employee, an interim AEF will be submitted by the operating unit to the Office of Human Resources when the employee received a full AEF from a prior operating unit and the employee has worked in his or her current operating unit no less than 120 days prior to the end of the rating cycle

462.3.6.2 Multiple Interim Evaluations

The Rating Official to whom an employee is assigned at the end of the rating cycle will prepare the employee's final AEF if the employee has not served in another position for 185 days or more, or if the employee has not served in any one position for more than 120 days during the entire rating cycle. Rating Officials are required to complete an AEF on an employee if the employee has been assigned to a position for 185 days or more.

To prepare the final AEFs, Rating Officials must consider any interim AEFs that may have been prepared and/or solicit performance feedback from previous supervisors as well as feedback from other people who have knowledge of the employee's performance. Rating Officials may incorporate information from interim AEFs into the final, full AEF.

For Foreign Service employees, if a Rating Official has received one or more interim AEFs for his or her consideration, these AEFs are to be attached to the AEF the Rating Official is completing so that they can be reviewed by an Appraisal Committee. The Appraisal Committee-approved final AEF and the interim AEFs become the official documents of the employee's performance and together are submitted to M/HR.

For full evaluations, Rating Officials must complete all sections of the AEF and complete the Skills Feedback Worksheet.

462.3.7 Civil Service Rating of Record

Every Civil Service employee shall receive a rating of record. A rating of record is the performance rating prepared at the end of the appraisal period for performance over the entire period. Ratings of record include adjectival performance ratings for each work objective and a summary rating.

If a rating of record cannot be prepared at the end of the rating cycle, the appraisal period shall be extended. A rating of record shall be prepared any time the minimum appraisal period has been met.

No Rating of Record shall be assigned for Civil Service employees solely for affecting an employee's Reduction In Force (RIF) retention standing.

Appraisal Committees must not assign Ratings of Record according to a predetermined or forced distribution. All Ratings of Record must reflect an employee's performance against specific work objectives.

462.3.7.1 Adjectival Ratings for Work Objectives

For each CS employee, the Rating Official must determine whether the employee met, did not meet, or exceeded each established work objective and performance measure and assign an adjectival rating. A CS employee's rating of record must be consistent with the procedures for deriving summary ratings in 462.3.7.2 below.

The five adjectival ratings follow:

- Exceptional: Work performance always exceeds established performance measures and expectations.
- Excellent: Work performance almost always exceeds established performance measures and expectations.
- Effective: Work performance consistently meets and occasionally exceeds established performance measures and expectations.

- Needs Improvement: Work performance meets some established performance measures and expectations.
- Unacceptable: Work performance does not meet established performance measures or expectations.

462.3.7.2 Summary Ratings

All CS employees shall be assigned a summary rating based on the adjectival ratings of each of the employee's work objectives, as follows:

- Exceptional (Level 5): A summary rating at the exceptional level must be assigned when all critical elements are rated at the Exceptional level and no critical element is lower than Exceptional.
- Excellent (Level 4): A summary rating at the Excellent level must be assigned when any critical element is rated at the Excellent level and no critical element is rated lower than Excellent.
- Effective (Level 3): A summary rating at the Effective level must be assigned when any critical element is rated at the Effective level and no critical element is rated lower than Effective.
- Needs Improvement (Level 2): A summary rating at the Needs Improvement level must be assigned when any critical element is rated at the Needs Improvement level and no critical element is rated lower than Needs Improvement.
- Unacceptable (Level 1): A summary rating at the Unacceptable level must be assigned if any critical element is rated at the Unacceptable level.

462.3.8 Appraisal Committee Review and Approval of the Evaluation

Appraisal Committees are responsible for reviewing and discussing each employee's AEF and SFW with the responsible Rating Official.

The SFW is prepared by the Rating Official and reviewed and discussed by the Appraisal Committee along with the draft AEF.

When reviewing an employee's evaluation, Appraisal Committees have the authority to review self-assessments, contact anyone (including the employee and selected 360 degree input sources) and review documents relied upon by the Rating Official.

Appraisal Committees are responsible for ensuring that AEFs are balanced, fair and accurate.

Appraisal Committees will consider statements prepared by the Offices of Financial Management, Procurement, and the General Counsel.

Appraisal Committees have the authority to direct and/or make substantive changes to an AEF.

Appraisal Committees will not approve any AEFs containing:

- a. Inadmissible comments;
- b. Internal inconsistencies;
- c. Insufficient examples of specific performance;
- d. Failure to discuss all work objectives, and for FS employees, failure to discuss all skill areas.
- e. Indications of hasty or insufficient preparation; or
- f. Improper formatting.

Appraisal Committees shall review and approve interim evaluations prior to the departure of Rating Officials or employees who have been assigned elsewhere.

Appraisal Committee members who reviewed and approved final and interim AEFs are to sign the AEF.

Appraisal Committees have the authority to request the Principal Officer to forward to M/HR for appropriate disciplinary action the name of any employee who fails to adhere to the policies, procedures and schedules of the Employee Evaluation Program.

462.3.8.1 Appraisal Committee FS Promotion Recommendations

Appraisal Committees shall make recommendations for promotion that have been based on its assessment of an employee's achievement of work objectives and his or her demonstration of skills.

Recommendations for promotion shall be based on merit. Appraisal Committees shall not consider an employee's race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, physical disability, or sexual orientation. Additionally, Appraisal Committees shall not consider an employee's retirement eligibility, recency of promotion, whether the employee has submitted an application for Senior Foreign Service consideration, nor any other extraneous factors when making promotion nomination decisions.

Appraisal Committees shall not nominate an FS Rating Official for promotion if the employee has failed to adhere to the policies, procedures, and schedules of the Employee Evaluation Program.

462.3.9 Employee Feedback Sessions

AEFs must only be given to employees after they have been approved by an Appraisal Committee and signed by the Rating Official and members of the Appraisal Committee.

Rating Officials must conduct end of appraisal period performance reviews with employees. Rating Officials are to discuss the employee's evaluation, areas for improvement, and career development needs and goals. Career development discussions may result in proposed formal training, on-the-job training, stretch assignments, or recommended reassignments.

The Rating Official must use the Skills Feedback Worksheet (SFW) (USAID 400-3) as a feedback tool and provide the employee with a copy. This document is not submitted to M/HR but remains with the employee and the Rating Official.

Employees must be given the opportunity to express their concerns with the evaluation and are strongly encouraged to prepare the Employee Statement (AID 400-2) after such discussions. Employees have 10 working days during which to review the approved AEF and prepare an Employee Statement, if desired.

Employees may also request modification to their final AEF.

462.3.10 Reconsideration of AEFs

An employee may request his or her Rating Official to modify the final AEF if he or she finds inconsistencies, factual errors, or gross omissions as follows:

- a.** The employee has 10 working days from date of receipt of his or her AEF in which to bring this matter to the attention of his or her Rating Official.
- b.** The Rating Officials have two working days in which to determine whether to accept or reject in whole or in part the employee's request for modification of his or her AEF. If the decision is to accept an employee's request in whole or in part, the Rating Official must submit the revised AEF to the Appraisal Committee for its approval.
- c.** An employee may appeal a Rating Official's determination to the Appraisal Committee and request a meeting with the Appraisal Committee.
- d.** An employee must provide all supporting documentation for his or her request at the time the appeal is made to the Appraisal Committee.

- e. Appraisal Committees shall review the request and the documentation and determine whether the AEF contains inconsistencies, factual errors, or gross omissions.
- f. If the Appraisal Committee determines that the AEF contains inconsistencies, factual errors, or gross omissions, it may modify the AEF or instruct the Rating Official to eliminate inconsistencies or factual errors, and/or add omitted information in the AEF.
- g. The Appraisal Committee shall provide the employee with a modified AEF and/or a memorandum, noting what modifications it would not approve. The Appraisal Committee's decision is final.

462.3.11 Submission of Annual Evaluation Forms

Approved evaluation forms shall be forwarded to the Bureau for Management, Office of Human Resources, Labor and Employee Relations and Performance Management Division (M/HR/LERPM) for retention in the employee's Official Performance File (OPF) and distribution as appropriate. The Principal Officer of an operating unit is responsible for ensuring the submission of all AEFs to the M/HR.

All AEFs submitted beyond the prescribed due dates must include a statement explaining the reasons for the lateness. M/HR/LERPM will review these statements to determine whether the delays have been adequately explained. If it is determined that the delay was not justified, M/HR/LERPM will refer the matter to the DAA/M/HR who will decide what action should be taken. The DAA/M/HR may decide to issue a critical letter, which will be placed in his or her Official Performance File for two years. If deemed warranted, this letter will serve to deny or reduce any award or performance bonus for the year in which the AEFs were due.

462.3.12 Training

All Agency employees shall receive training and information about the Employee Evaluation Program. Information will include a guidebook (**See Additional Help document, [Employee Evaluation Program Guidebook](#)**) describing the operation of the program and the roles and responsibilities of employees, Rating Officials, and Appraisal Committees. In addition to this and Agency sponsored supervisory and managerial courses and other learning activities, operating units may request special briefings or training sessions on the program.

462.4 MANDATORY REFERENCES

462.4.1 External Mandatory References

- a. [Foreign Service Act of 1980, as amended, Chapter 6, Promotion and Retention](#)

462.4.2 Internal Mandatory References

- a. [ADS 463, Foreign Service Boards](#)
- b. [AID Form 400-1, Annual Evaluation Form](#)
- c. [AID Form 400-2, Employee Statement](#)
- d. **AID Form 400-3, Skills Feedback Worksheet**
 - [Civil Service](#)
 - [Foreign Service](#)

462.5 ADDITIONAL HELP

- a. [Employee Evaluation Program Guidebook](#)

462.6 DEFINITIONS

The terms and definitions listed below have been incorporated into the ADS Glossary. See the ADS Glossary for all ADS terms and definitions. (See [ADS Glossary](#))

360 degree sources

Customers, peers, other managers, subordinates, and other individuals with whom or for whom an employee may have worked who can provide feedback, from their various perspectives, about an employee's performance during any period of performance currently being evaluated. (Chapter 462)

acceptable level of competence

For the Civil Service, an acceptable level of competence means "Effective" performance by an employee of the duties and responsibilities of their assigned position which warrants advancement of the employee's rate of basic pay to the next higher step of the grade of their position. (Chapter 462)

annual rating cycle

A one-year evaluation period which that may have different beginning and end dates for different categories of employees (e.g., Civil Service and Foreign Service). (Chapter 462)

Appraisal Committee

A committee that reviews and provides management input into employee work objectives and evaluations; nominates Foreign Service (FS) employees for promotion; recommends FS employees for tenure; and decides which employees should receive performance or other types of awards. (Chapter 462)

Appraisal Committee Representative

A member of the Appraisal Committee, who acts as liaison to the Appraisal Committee for a specific employee and his/her Rating Official. (Chapter 462)

critical element (Civil Service)

A work objective which contributes toward accomplishing organizational goals and objectives and which is of such importance that unacceptable performance would result in unacceptable performance in the position. (Chapter 462)

Effective rating (Civil Service)

Indicates that performance meets the performance measures established for a Civil Service work objective. (Chapter 462)

feedback

Communicating to employees the extent to which their performance does not meet, meets, or exceeds expectations, the adequacy of their relevant skills, and their progress toward career development goals. (Chapter 462)

interim evaluation

An evaluation covering a period of performance that is long enough to require written documentation of performance against an established performance plan and yet not long enough to be considered representative of the employee's performance for the entire annual rating cycle. (Chapter 462)

mid-cycle review

A mandatory progress review to be held by the Rating Official and employee at the mid-point in the appraisal period. (Chapter 462)

minimum appraisal period (Civil Service)

The minimum performance period that must be completed before a performance rating can be given. (Chapter 462)

noncritical element (Civil Service)

A work objective that, while sufficiently important to be documented on the Annual Evaluation Form (AEF), would not result in an Unacceptable summary rating for the annual rating cycle if performance on this objective was unacceptable. (Chapter 462)

opportunity period (Civil Service)

The period during which an employee is given a reasonable time to demonstrate acceptable performance, where the performance had been determined to be unacceptable. (Chapter 462)

performance awards

Awards based on an employee's approved AEF for the rating cycle. (Chapter 462)

performance measure

Statements of standards (qualitative or quantitative) that measure an employee's achievement of a given work objective. (Chapter 462)

performance rating (Civil Service)

A written appraisal of performance compared to the performance measure(s) for each critical or non-critical element on which there has been an opportunity to perform for the minimum period. (Chapter 462)

Principal Officer

The most senior officer in a USAID operating unit who establishes Appraisal Committee(s) for that operating unit, e.g., Assistant Administrator, Independent USAID/W Office Director, Mission Director, or USAID Representative. (Chapter 462)

progress review

Progress reviews are held periodically throughout the rating cycle during which the Rating Official provides feedback to the employee about performance and/or progress toward career development goals. Also see mid-cycle review. (Chapter 462)

Rating Official

The employee's supervisor as designated by the Principal Officer. (Chapter 462)

Rating of Record (Civil Service)

The performance rating prepared at the end of the appraisal period for performance over the entire period and the assignment of a summary rating. (Chapter 462)

summary rating (Civil Service)

An adjectival rating (Exceptional, Excellent, Effective, Needs Improvement, or Unacceptable). (Chapter 462)

Unacceptable Performance

Performance that fails to significantly meet the performance measure established for a work objective. (Chapter 462)

within grade increase

A periodic increase in an employee's rate of basic pay from one step of the grade of his/her position to the next higher step of that grade. (Chapter 462)

work objectives

Expectations for an employee established by management for a particular rating period. (Chapter 462)